

REMARKS

Claim 5, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15, 20-21, 23, 27 and 29 have been amended. Claims 6-7, 10, 13 and 30 have been cancelled. Claim 31 has been added. Claims 5, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15, 20-23, 26-29 and 30 are presented for further examination.

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed December 23, 2008, and the Response to Office Action filed by Applicants on March 23, 2009. This is a Supplemental Response and is being filed before the mailing of the next Action from the Office. For reasons stated below, all of the pending claims are allowable.

Claim 5, for example, calls for two curves: a DC feed curve and a synthesized curve. The claim specifies that the DC feed curve includes the current limit region and at least one of an anti-saturation region and resistance feed region, and that the synthesized curve is in the current limit region of the first curve (namely, the DC feed curve). Exemplary embodiments of such an arrangement are shown in Figures 4 and 7. The references cited by the Examiner only disclose a standard DC feed curve, but not a synthesized curve that is in the current limit region of that DC feed curve (the DC feed curve is the first curve that has the various regions). Moreover, the cited references also do not teach that the synthesized curve is a linear curve with a negative slope, as called for by claim 5. For these reasons alone, claim 5 is allowable.

Claim 5 is allowable for additional reasons. In particular, Claim 5 calls for determining a second value representative of a difference between the first value and the current limit value based on determining that the first value is greater than the current limit value. The cited references are silent with respect to this claimed feature.

Claim 5 also calls for determining a representative loop voltage based on a relation between the second value and a synthesized curve, wherein the relation comprises the representative loop voltage being equal to a predetermined voltage value added to a product of

the slope of the synthesized curve and the second value. The cited references are silent with respect to this claimed feature.

For at least these reasons, claim 5 is allowable. For similar reasons, the remaining pending claims are also allowable.

In view of at least the reasons presented above, the pending claims are allowable. As such, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Houston, Texas telephone number (713) 934-4064 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

Date: May 8, 2009

By: /Ruben S. Bains/
Ruben S. Bains, Reg. No. 46,532
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77042
Tel: (713) 934-4064 – Fax: (713) 934-7011
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)